

Lansburgh & Co.

420-26 7th St.

417-25 8th St.

Great Friday Values

Get Ready to Save More Than Half on Silks

About 8,000 yards go on sale tomorrow in short lengths, representing every desirable weave for every use. Lengths sufficient for waist suits and dresses. We have divided them into three lots, as follows:

25c. for 50c. and 69c.	35c. for 75c. and \$1.00	40c. for \$1.25 and \$1.50
Rough Shantung, Corded Taffeta, Checked Silks, White Habutai, Black Pongees, Foulards, Colored Satins, etc.	Glaze Taffetas, Satin Foulards, Indias, Black Taffetas, Colored Cyranos, Crepe de Chines, Black Habutai, etc.	Louisines, Fancy Silks, Checked Silks, Black Satins, Beau de Soies, White Taffetas, Jasper Silks, etc.

Dress Goods Worth 50c.

One hundred remnants Dress Goods, in such fabrics as GRAY PLAIDS, MIXTURES, CASHMERE, MOHAIRS, CHALLIES, BATISTE, CHECKS, etc. All clean, fresh goods. The most-wanted fabrics of the season. If cut from the piece, worth up to 50c. Choice, per yard.

25c.

37½c. White Silk

Cord Poplins, 19c.

This beautiful white silk-finished cotton fabric is specially adapted for waists; 24 inches wide, and will launder. A 37½c. kind, yard.

19c.

\$1.00 Waists,

69c.

WOMEN'S WAISTS of figured madras; open front; three broad trucks on either side; sizes 34 to 44.

Women's Underwear,

35c.

for 50c. Jersey-fitting Fleece-lined Vests and Pants.

50c. for 75c. Richelle Ribbed Medium-weight Vests and Pants; vests high neck with long or short sleeves; pants ankle or knee length.

98c. Suitings, 69c.

50-inch Fancy Suitings; broken plaids and stripes; in blue, brown, gray, green and black.

\$1.50 Cloth, \$1.25.

52-inch All-wool Sateen-finished Chiffon Venetian; in desirable shades and black.

Boys' Norfolk Suits,

\$1.98.

250 Suits of cassimere and navy blue serge; just arrived in time to go in this Friday sale; they have straight pants in sizes 5 to 16. These Suits would be marked if bought through the usual channel \$2.50 to \$3.50.

Center Pieces, &c.

STAMPED LINEN CENTER PIECES in beautiful floral, eyelet and conventional designs.

CREPE PAPER, in all colors, at 10c.

7c. SWISS BUREAU SCARFS and PILLOW SHAMS.

BEAUTIFUL 18x54 RENAISSANCE SCARFS, the kind that sold for \$2.50.

ALL of the latest Stamped, Tinted and Lithographed PILLOW TOPS, which sold for 50c.

33c.

Corsets, 59c.

A lot of C. B. Thomson Glove-fitting Corsets, of batiste and coutil; high and low bust; short, medium and dip hip. Values up to \$1.50.

75c. Short Knit Underskirts, 49c.

Of cotton. Shades: light blue, pink, red, gray and black. Finished with fancy border; good width and length.

Women's Flannelette Gowns, 49c.

In stripes of light blue and pink. Yoke front and back; finished with collar, neatly trimmed; full sleeve; excellent width and length. Sizes 15, 16 and 17.

Black Cheviot,

\$1.39.

50-inch All-wool Black Cheviot, heavy weight, for coat suits; \$1.50 usual price.

Black Batiste, 48c.

39-inch All-wool Black Batiste (soft finish) for separate waists; 90c. usual price.

Wool Blanket,

\$3.48.

11-4, in white and gray; red, blue and pink borders; usual price, \$4.25.

Wool Blanket, \$3.98.

11-4 white; closely woven; finely finished; all borders; wide silk binding; usual price, \$4.80.

Napkins, &c.

Size 18-inch Undressed SILVER BLEACHED GERMAN DAMASK NAPKINS, dozen.

Size 21-inch Fine Quality BLEACHED-BRUSH DAMASK NAPKINS, per dozen.

Size 18x38 HEAVY WEAVE HEM-STITCHED GERMAN LINEN HUCK TOWELS, each.

EXTRA SIZE HEAVY QUALITY BLEACHED TURKISH BATH TOWELS, each.

25c.

Black Panama,

98c.

54-inch All-wool Black Chiffon Panama, for separate skirts; a dust shaker; \$1.25 usual price.

Ruffled Net Curtains.

RUFFLED NET CURTAINS, sold from \$2 to \$2.75 pair; slightly soiled from being used as samples; only one pair of a kind. Special for Friday, pair.

Lace Curtains,

98c.

SCOTCH LACE CURTAINS—Point de croix and Irish point effects; 54 inches wide; 3½ yards long; strong net; heavy effective borders; \$1.50 usual price.

Tapestry Portieres,

fringed top and bottom; colors are red, green, olive and attractive combinations of red and green; 54 inches wide; 3½ yards long; heavy effective borders; \$1.50 usual price.

Sheeting, &c.

10-4 SUNAPEE BLEACHED SHEETING, from 24 to 36 inches wide; double-bed width; as many yards as you like; 30c. value.

8-4 BLEACHED SHEETING, PEARL BLEND, heavy round thread; 27c. value.

32-INCH BED TICKING; narrow blue stripe; feather proof; 16c. grade.

12½c.

LOCAL NOTES

(Continued from First Page.)

ent asked the said four respondents whether they would like to compare the said anonymous letter with the relator's acknowledged letters aforesaid, to which three of the said respondents replied that they did not wish to do so. The relator believed the relator to have written it; whereupon, the said superintendent then suggested that the relator should consider the question of resigning or being dismissed, to which suggestion the relator replied that, inasmuch as he had not written the anonymous letter, he would not be derelict in any other way, he saw no occasion for either resigning or being dismissed, and was content with the said superintendent's recommendation to him to intend from any further interview in the premises.

What He Was Up Against.

"On the day following the occurrences narrated in the foregoing paragraph, to-wit, October 10, 1906, the relator, of his own motion, called on the said superintendent and denied all knowledge of the said anonymous letter, upon which the said superintendent stated to the relator as follows: 'What you are up against is this letter. It's up to you to prove to those four men that you did not write this letter, meaning by the said four men the said four respondents, who, as aforesaid, were present in the office of the said superintendent on the preceding day, as aforesaid. Thereupon the relator called upon three of the said four respondents, and asked them to see the fourth, and to each of the three seen by him the relator again denied authorship of the said anonymous letter and advised them to advise the superintendent, and was told by the third that he, the said third, stood for fair play, and that the relator would be given a chance to be heard. Thereafter, to-wit, October 16, 1906, the relator again called upon the said superintendent and inquired of him the result of his representations, and was informed by the said superintendent that some of the respondents wanted to dismiss him, the relator, upon which the relator asked the said superintendent if such action was to be taken without giving him, the relator, a trial, to which the said superintendent replied that, according to legal opinions received by the said board of education, a trial was not necessary, even when charges had been preferred; and upon the relator's replying that he thought one of the said opinions to be a qualified one, the said superintendent stated that the relator's reply, in regard to the charges against him, upon which the relator followed day at 1 o'clock in the afternoon to find what disposition would be made of his relator's case.

Consulted Counsel.

"The relator thereupon consulted counsel, and, upon the advice of such counsel, caused to be delivered, and was in fact delivered, to the said superintendent on the morning of the following day, to-wit, October 17, 1906, a letter from said counsel to the said superintendent, in the following words:

"Mr. F. L. Cardoso has consulted me in reference to his present situation, with which you are familiar, and tells me that he desires to resign his position as principal, and is entitled as of right to be represented by counsel in respect of the pending charges against him. I am of opinion that Mr. Cardoso has the right to be so represented, and that the necessity of ascertaining for him, but I feel safe in adding that, if he is not so represented, he will be at a disadvantage. I have, accordingly, to ask that, if the charges against Mr. Cardoso are to be pressed, I may be given, as his counsel, due notice to that effect and also of any hearing in the matter, with the privilege of attending in his behalf."

"The relator, as suggested by the said superintendent, called upon the latter at the hour indicated, namely, 1 o'clock, in the morning of October 18, 1906, and, being kept waiting within a few minutes of two hours without admittance to the office of the said superintendent, he went to him, dressed by his counsel to the relator, advising him, the relator, as to the course to be pursued by him, and he was subjected to any further interrogation in the premises, upon receiving which said superintendent, after a short conference with the relator, and in manifest indignation, said to the relator: 'I have, accordingly, to ask that, if the charges against Mr. Cardoso are to be pressed, I may be given, as his counsel, due notice to that effect and also of any hearing in the matter, with the privilege of attending in his behalf.'"

Meeting of Board.

"At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the said October 17, 1906, the respondents, as the board of education aforesaid, held a regular meeting at the Franklin School building, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, of the relators being present, and, in the course of the said meeting, the said superintendent presented to the said board, through its assistant secretary, at the time acting as secretary, a communication recommending the relator's dismissal from his position as supervising principal, as aforesaid, upon the grounds that the relator had been guilty of dereliction of duty, and, besides, had been guilty, according to the best of the said superintendent's knowledge and belief, of writing the anonymous letter aforesaid, and, at the same time, presented to the said board, through the said superintendent, a letter aforesaid of the relator, in which the relator, as superintendent, whereupon the relator's said counsel, being present, asked the respondents, touching the question of his dismissal, an opportunity to be heard on the question of the relator's right to a hearing in the premises with the right of counsel, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator, to a hearing in the premises, and, accordingly, demanded such a hearing, which was denied; and the relator's said counsel, having in the course of the said meeting pointed out to the respondents that the recommendation of the said superintendent in the premises involved a finding by the relator, as aforesaid, and in effect of the authorship of the said anonymous letter, matters respecting which, as the relator's said counsel contended, the relator was entitled to a hearing as aforesaid, and, having further pointed out to the respondents that the said superintendent's recommendation would involve a judgment by them, the respondents, touching the question of the relator's dismissal, and in the presence of a friend of his, the relator's, choosing, and the respondents having accorded said counsel the desired opportunity, the said superintendent, then and there, in the presence of him, the relator, asserted the right of him, the relator,